

*C1
Coral
D1*

means for reproducing the still picture information recorded in the first recording area based on the first management information stored in the second recording area.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-30 are presently active; Claims 16-20 having been canceled, and Claims 21-30 having been added by way of the present amendment. Support for new Claims 21-30 can be found at least in Figures 1, 10A, 12, and 31, and in corresponding descriptive portions of Applicants' specification. No new matter has been added by the present amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner renumbered Claim 28-31 as Claims 16-20. Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 16-20 were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,702. Claims 16-20 were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,222. Claims 16-20 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 28-31 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/076,285 (Attorney Docket No. 219533US2S DIV). Claims 16-20 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 28-31 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/076,844 (Attorney Docket No. 219539US2S DIV). Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,242,499; hereinafter “Kim”) in view of Saeki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,026; hereinafter “Saeki”).

Claims 16-30 have been canceled by way of the present amendment. Therefore, rejections pertaining to the same have been rendered moot. However, the substantive rejections of Claims 16-30 will be addressed as if applied to new Claims 21-30.

Regarding the related patent documents cited in the rejections and provisional rejections under obviousness-type double-patenting, Applicants submit that new Claims 21-30 are patentably distinct over the claims of these documents. For example, independent Claims 21 and 24-26 each recite “at least one still picture video object entry having playback time information of an audio part of the still picture object.”¹ Independent Claims 27-30 each recite “video part size information indicating a size of a video part of the corresponding still picture video object.”²

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection relying on any of the related documents would be improper because the presently claimed inventions are not obvious variations of the inventions defined by the claims of the related documents. For example, referring to new Claim 21, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of a still picture video object entry having playback time information of an audio part of the still picture object with any of the claimed inventions of the related documents. None of the cited claims of the related documents include any recitation directed to an audio part of a still picture object, let alone playback time information associated with the audio part. Moreover, the cited claims of the related documents do not provide any indication that the inclusion of the “playback time information of an audio part” feature would be an obvious variation of the cited defined inventions.

Also, for example, referring to new Claim 27, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of a temporary

¹ e.g., Claim 21 at lines 13 and 14.

² e.g., Claim 27 at lines 17 and 18.

erase flag and a video part size information with any of the claimed inventions of the related documents. None of the cited claims of the related documents recite both features of a temporary erase flag and a video part size information. Further, the cited claims of the related documents do not provide any indication that the inclusion of the omitted feature (i.e., a temporary erase flag or a video part size information) would be an obvious variation of the cited defined inventions.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the presently claimed inventions are patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in the related documents.

Regarding Kim and Saeki, Applicants submit that these documents do not, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest new Claims 21-30. As noted above, Claim 21 recites “at least one still picture video object entry having playback time information of an audio part of the still picture object”³ (e.g., A_PB_TM in Figure 32). Also, as noted above, Claim 27 recites, among other features, “video part size information indicating a size of a video part of the corresponding still picture video object”⁴ (e.g., V_PART_SZ in Figure 31).

In contrast, Kim discloses a method of creating an recording presentation order management information, in which information is recorded in a Still Picture AV File Information Table (S_AVFIT; Figure 1). Recorded in S_AVFIT are VOBIs (col. 5, lines 49-51). Kim does not disclose or suggest the feature of a still picture video object entry having playback time information of an audio part of the still picture object, as recited in new Claim 21. Also, Kim does not disclose or suggest the feature of video part size information indicating a size of a video part of the corresponding still picture video object, as recited in new Claim 27. As such, Kim fails to disclose or suggest new Claims 21 and 27.

³ Claim 21 at lines 13 and 14.

⁴ Claim 27 at lines 17 and 18.

Saeki does not remedy the deficiencies of Kim with respect to new Claims 21 and 27. Saeki discloses an optical disc including time map information 821b (Figure 11), where time map information 821b is used to convert arbitrary VOB reproduction time to VOB storage positions.⁵ However, Saeki is silent as to a still picture video object group and the management thereof. Rather, Saeki is directed to the recording and management of movie data (e.g., using time map information). Saeki does not disclose or suggest the feature of a still picture video object entry having playback time information of an audio part of the still picture object, as recited in new Claim 21. Also, Saeki does not disclose or suggest the feature of video part size information indicating a size of a video part of the corresponding still picture video object, as recited in new Claim 27. As such, Saeki fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kim with respect to new Claims 21 and 27.

Accordingly, new Claims 21 and 27 are patentable over Kim and Saeki, either taken individually or in combination. Claims 24-26 and Claims 28-30 respectively recite features substantially similar to those of Claims 21 and 27. Therefore, these claims are likewise patentable with respect to the cited documents for at least the reasons discussed above.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

⁵ Saeki at col. 6, lines 23-25.

Finally, the attention of the Patent Office is directed to the change of address of Applicants' representative, effective January 6, 2003:

Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, P.C.
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Please direct all future communications to this new address.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER AND NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James J. Kulbaski".

James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648
Attorney of Record
Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866.

JJK/SAM:CHY/pch
HATTYCHY219507US219507 AM.DOC
LAST PRINTED 4/16/2003 11:31 AM